

The Complexity of Approximating Bounded-Degree Boolean $\#CSP^*$

Martin Dyer,[†] Leslie Ann Goldberg,[‡]
Markus Jalsenius[‡] and David Richerby[†]

Abstract

The degree of a CSP instance is the maximum number of times that a variable may appear in the scope of constraints. We consider the approximate counting problem for Boolean CSPs with bounded-degree instances for constraint languages containing the two unary constant relations $\{0\}$ and $\{1\}$. When the maximum degree is at least 25 we obtain a complete classification of the complexity of this problem. It is exactly solvable in polynomial-time if every relation in the constraint language is affine. It is equivalent to the problem of approximately counting independent sets in bipartite graphs if every relation can be expressed as conjunctions of $\{0\}$, $\{1\}$ and binary implication. Otherwise, there is no FPRAS unless $\mathbf{NP} = \mathbf{RP}$. For lower degree bounds, additional cases arise in which the complexity is related to the complexity of approximately counting independent sets in hypergraphs.

1 Introduction

In the constraint satisfaction problem (CSP), we seek to assign values from some domain to a set of variables, while satisfying given constraints on the combinations of values that certain subsets of the variables may take. Constraint satisfaction problems are ubiquitous in computer science, with close connections to graph theory, database query evaluation, type inference, satisfiability, scheduling and artificial intelligence [26, 28, 31]. CSP can also be reformulated in terms of homomorphisms between relational structures [21] and conjunctive query containment in database theory [26]. Weighted versions of CSP also appear in statistical physics, where they correspond to partition functions of spin systems [37].

We give formal definitions in Section 2 but, for now, consider an undirected graph G and the CSP where the domain is $\{\text{red}, \text{green}, \text{blue}\}$, the

* Funded in part by the EPSRC grant “The Complexity of Counting in Constraint Satisfaction Problems”.

[†] School of Computing, University of Leeds, Leeds, LS2 9JT, U.K.

[‡] Department of Computer Science, University of Liverpool, Liverpool, L69 3BX, U.K.

variables are the vertices of G and the constraints specify that, for every edge $xy \in G$, x and y must be assigned different values. Thus, in a satisfying assignment, no two adjacent vertices are given the same colour: the CSP is satisfiable if, and only if, the graph is 3-colourable. As a second example, given a formula in 3-CNF, we can write a system of constraints over the variables, with domain $\{\text{true}, \text{false}\}$, that requires the assignment to each clause of the formula to satisfy at least one of the literals. Clearly, the resulting CSP is directly equivalent to the original satisfiability problem.

1.1 Decision CSP

In the *uniform constraint satisfaction problem*, we are given the set of constraints explicitly, as lists of allowable combinations for given subsets of the variables; these lists can be considered as relations over the domain. Since it includes problems such as 3-SAT and 3-COLOURABILITY, uniform CSP is **NP**-complete. However, uniform CSP also includes problems in **P**, such as 2-SAT and 2-COLOURABILITY, raising the natural question of what restrictions lead to tractable problems. There are two natural ways to restrict CSP: we can restrict the form of the instance and we can restrict the form of the constraints.

The most common restriction to CSP is to allow only certain fixed relations in the constraints. The list of allowable relations is known as the *constraint language* and we write $\text{CSP}(\Gamma)$ for the so-called *non-uniform* CSP in which each constraint states that the values assigned to some tuple of variables must be a tuple in a specified relation in Γ .

The classic example of this is due to Schaefer [32]. Restricting to Boolean constraint languages (i.e., those with domain $\{0, 1\}$), he showed that $\text{CSP}(\Gamma)$ is in **P** if Γ is included in one of six classes and is **NP**-complete, otherwise. The Boolean case of CSP is often referred to as “generalized satisfiability” in the literature. More recent work by Bulatov has produced a corresponding dichotomy for the three-element domain [2].

These results of Schaefer and Bulatov restrict the size of the domain but allow relations of arbitrary arity in the constraint language. The converse restriction — relations of restricted arity over arbitrary finite domains — has also been studied in depth. In particular, the case where Γ consists of a single binary relation corresponds exactly to the directed graph homomorphism problem, and to undirected graph homomorphism if we further restrict the relation to be symmetric. In the latter case, Hell and Nešetřil have shown that $\text{CSP}(E) \in \mathbf{P}$ if E is the edge relation of an undirected bipartite graph or a graph with a self-loop and $\text{CSP}(E)$ is **NP**-complete if E is the edge relation of any other undirected graph [23]. The case where E is the edge relation of a loop-free directed graph is currently open. Hell and Nešetřil conjecture that, for any binary relation E , $\text{CSP}(E)$ is either in **P** or **NP**-complete [24, Conjecture 5.12], though we are not aware of any conjecture

on what form this dichotomy might take.

Note that, for all Γ discussed above, $\text{CSP}(\Gamma)$ has been either in $\mathbf{P}$ or $\mathbf{NP}$ -complete. Feder and Vardi have conjectured that this holds for every constraint language. Ladner has shown that no such dichotomy can exist for the whole of $\mathbf{NP}$ because, if $\mathbf{P} \neq \mathbf{NP}$, there is an infinite, strict hierarchy between the two [29]. However, there are problems in $\mathbf{NP}$, such as graph Hamiltonicity and even connectedness, that cannot be expressed as $\text{CSP}(\Gamma)$ for any finite Γ ¹ and Ladner’s diagonalization does not seem to be expressible in CSP [21]. Resolving Hell and Nešetřil’s conjecture for a certain class of relatively simple acyclic digraphs would immediately resolve the dichotomy for CSP [21].

Restricting the form of the instances has also been a fruitful direction of research. Dechter and Pearl [9] and Freunder [22] have shown that, if we restrict to instances of tree width at most any fixed k , while still allowing arbitrary constraint languages, then uniform CSP is decidable deterministically in polynomial time; see also [27]. An alternative, incomparable, restriction is on the degree of instances, which is the maximum number of times that any variable appears in the scopes of constraints. However, not much is known: Dalmau and Ford have shown that, for any fixed Boolean constraint language Γ containing the constant unary relations $R_{\text{zero}} = \{0\}$ and $R_{\text{one}} = \{1\}$, the complexity of $\text{CSP}(\Gamma)$ for instances of degree at most three is exactly the same as the complexity of $\text{CSP}(\Gamma)$ with no degree restriction [8]. The case where variables may appear at most twice has not yet been completely classified; it is known that degree-2 $\text{CSP}(\Gamma)$ is as hard as general $\text{CSP}(\Gamma)$ in every case where Γ contains R_{zero} and R_{one} and some relation that is not a Δ -matroid [20]; the known polynomial-time cases come from restrictions on the kinds of Δ -matroids that appear in Γ [8].

1.2 Counting CSP

A generalization of the classical constraint satisfaction problem is to ask how many satisfying solutions there are, rather than just whether the constraints are satisfiable. This is referred to as the counting CSP problem, $\#\text{CSP}$. Clearly, the decision problem is reducible to counting: if we can efficiently count the number of solutions, we can efficiently determine whether there is at least one. However, the converse does not hold: for example, there are well-known polynomial-time algorithms that determine whether a graph admits a perfect matching but it is $\#\mathbf{P}$ -complete to count the number of perfect matchings even in a bipartite graph [35].

The class $\#\mathbf{P}$ can be considered the counting “analogue” of $\mathbf{NP}$: it is defined to be the class of functions f for which there is a nondeterministic,

¹Every $\text{CSP}(\Gamma)$ is defined by a sentence of existential monadic second-order logic. However, no formula of that logic defines the class of connected graphs [18, 19] and it follows from the proof of this that Hamiltonicity is also not definable.

polynomial-time Turing machine that has exactly $f(x)$ accepting paths for input x [34]. It is easily seen that the counting version of any **NP** decision problem is in $\#\mathbf{P}$. Note that, although $\#\mathbf{P}$ plays a similar role in the complexity of function problems as **NP** does for decision problems, problems that are complete for $\#\mathbf{P}$ under appropriate reductions are, under standard complexity-theoretic assumptions, considerably harder than **NP**-complete problems: Toda has shown that $\mathbf{P}^{\#\mathbf{P}}$ includes the whole of the polynomial hierarchy [33].

Although it is not known if there is a dichotomy for CSP, Bulatov has recently shown that, for every Γ , $\#\text{CSP}(\Gamma)$ is either computable in polynomial time or $\#\mathbf{P}$ -complete [3]. However, Bulatov’s dichotomy sheds little light on which constraint languages yield polynomial-time counting CSPs and which do not. The criterion of the dichotomy is based on “defects” in a certain infinite algebra built up from the polymorphisms of Γ and it is open whether the characterization is even decidable.

So, although there is a full dichotomy for $\#\text{CSP}(\Gamma)$, results for restricted forms of constraint language are still of interest. In the case of Boolean constraint languages, Creignou and Hermann have shown that only one of Schaefer’s polynomial-time cases survives the transition to counting: $\#\text{CSP}(\Gamma)$ has a polynomial time algorithm if every relation in Γ is affine (that is, if it is the solution set of a system of linear equations over GF_2) and is $\#\mathbf{P}$ -complete, otherwise [7]. It is not surprising that there are fewer tractable cases — it is easy to arrange that every instance of $\text{CSP}(\Gamma)$ be trivially satisfiable (for example, by setting all variables to zero), but the number of non-trivial solutions might be difficult to compute. It is interesting that the tractable cases correspond precisely to affine cases. Dyer, Goldberg and Jerrum [14] extended Creignou and Hermann’s result to weighted Boolean $\#\text{CSP}$. Cai, Liu and Xia [4] further extended the result to the case of complex weights and show that the dichotomy holds for the restriction of the problem in which instances have degree 3. Their result implies that the degree-3 problem $\#\text{CSP}_3(\Gamma)$ ($\#\text{CSP}(\Gamma)$ restricted to instances of degree 3) has a polynomial time algorithm if every relation in Γ is affine and is $\#\mathbf{P}$ -complete, otherwise.

The case where Γ contains a single, symmetric binary relation E corresponds exactly to the problem of counting the number of homomorphisms from an input graph to some fixed undirected graph H , also known as the counting H -colouring problem. Dyer and Greenhill have shown that $\#\text{CSP}(\{E\})$ is in polynomial time if E is a complete relation or defines a complete bipartite graph and is $\#\mathbf{P}$ -complete otherwise [16]. The dichotomy for directed acyclic graphs has been characterized by Dyer, Goldberg and Paterson [15] but it is still an open problem to characterize the cyclic directed graphs that lead to tractable $\#\text{CSP}$ problems. In contrast to the decision problem, it is not known whether a direct proof of the dichotomy for general directed graphs would yield an alternative proof of the dichotomy

for arbitrary constraint languages.

However, restricting the tree-width of instances has a dramatic effect. In the case of counting H -colourings, restricting the instance to be a graph of tree-width at most k means that the problem is solvable in linear time for any graph H , a result due to Díaz, Serna and Thilikos [10]. This result follows immediately from Courcelle’s theorem, which says that, if a decision problem is definable in monadic second-order logic (which H -colouring is, for any fixed H), then both it and the corresponding counting problem are computable in linear time [5, 6]. However, invocations of Courcelle’s theorem hide enormous constants in the notation $\mathcal{O}(n)$ (in this case, a tower of twos of height $|H|$), while the work of Díaz et al. not only yields practical constants but can also be applied to classes of instances where the tree-width is allowed to grow logarithmically with the order of the graph, rather than being constant.

1.3 Approximate counting

Since $\#\text{CSP}(\Gamma)$ is very often $\#\mathbf{P}$ -complete, approximation algorithms play an important role. The key concept is that of a *fully polynomial randomized approximation scheme* (FPRAS). This is a randomized algorithm for computing some function $f(x)$ that takes as its input x and a constant $\epsilon > 0$, computes a value Y such that $e^{-\epsilon} \leq Y/f(x) \leq e^\epsilon$ with probability at least $\frac{3}{4}$ and runs in time polynomial in both $|x|$ and ϵ^{-1} . (See Section 2.4 for details.)

Dyer, Goldberg and Jerrum have classified the complexity of approximately computing $\#\text{CSP}(\Gamma)$ for Boolean constraint languages [13]. In the case where all relations in Γ are affine, $\#\text{CSP}(\Gamma)$ can be computed exactly in polynomial time by the result of Creignou and Hermann discussed above [7]. Otherwise, if every relation in Γ can be defined by a conjunction of pins and Boolean implications, then $\#\text{CSP}(\Gamma)$ is as hard to approximate as the problem $\#\text{BIS}$ of counting independent sets in a bipartite graph; otherwise, $\#\text{CSP}(\Gamma)$ is as hard to approximate as the problem $\#\text{SAT}$ of counting the number of satisfying truth assignments of a Boolean formula. Dyer, Goldberg, Greenhill and Jerrum have shown that the latter problem is complete for $\#\mathbf{P}$ under appropriate approximation-preserving reductions (see Section 2.4) and has no FPRAS unless $\mathbf{NP} = \mathbf{RP}$ [12], which is thought to be unlikely. The complexity of $\#\text{BIS}$ is currently open: there is no known FPRAS but it is not known to be $\#\mathbf{P}$ -complete, either. $\#\text{BIS}$ is known to be complete with respect to approximation-preserving reductions in a logically-defined subclass of $\#\mathbf{P}$ [12].

1.4 Our result

In this paper we consider the complexity of approximately solving Boolean #CSP problems when instances have bounded degree. Following Dalmau and Ford [8] and Feder [20] we consider the case in which $R_{\text{zero}} = \{0\}$ and $R_{\text{one}} = \{1\}$ are available. Our main result (Corollary 24) is a trichotomy for the case in which instances have maximum degree d for some $d \geq 25$. If every relation in Γ is affine then $\#\text{CSP}_d(\Gamma \cup \{R_{\text{zero}}, R_{\text{one}}\})$ is solvable in polynomial time. Otherwise, if every relation in Γ can be expressed as conjunctions of R_{zero} , R_{one} and binary implication, then $\#\text{CSP}_d(\Gamma \cup \{R_{\text{zero}}, R_{\text{one}}\})$ is equivalent in approximation complexity to #BIS. Otherwise, it has no FPRAS unless $\mathbf{NP} = \mathbf{RP}$. Theorem 23 gives a partial classification of the complexity when $d < 25$. In the new cases that arise here the complexity is given in terms of $\#w\text{-HIS}_d$, the complexity of counting independent sets in hypergraphs of degree at most d with hyper-edges of size at most w . The complexity of this problem is not fully understood. We explain what is known about it in Section 6.

1.5 Organization

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we define the basic notation and relational operations that we will use throughout the paper. We formally define bounded-degree CSPs, and the properties of hypergraphs that we will use in the paper. In Section 3, we introduce the classes of relations that we will use throughout the paper and give some of their basic properties. A key tool in this type of work [4, 20] is characterizing the ability of certain relations or sets of relations to assert equalities between variables: we show when this can be done in Section 4. The last piece of preparatory work is to show that every Boolean relation that cannot simulate equality in this way is definable either by a conjunction of pins and either ORs or NANDs, which is done in Section 5. Our classification of the complexity of bounded-degree Boolean counting CSPs follows, in Section 6.

2 Preliminaries

2.1 Basic notation

We write $\bar{a}$ for the tuple $\langle a_1, \dots, a_r \rangle$, which we often shorten to $\bar{a} = a_1 \dots a_r$. We write a^r for the r -tuple whose every element is equal to a and $\bar{a}\bar{b}$ for the tuple formed from the elements of $\bar{a}$ followed by those of $\bar{b}$.

The *bit-wise complement* of a relation $R \subseteq \{0, 1\}^r$ is the relation

$$\tilde{R} = \{ \langle a_1 \oplus 1, \dots, a_r \oplus 1 \rangle \mid \bar{a} \in R \},$$

where $\oplus$ denotes addition modulo 2.

We say that a relation R is *ppp-definable*² in a relation R' and write $R \leq_{\text{ppp}} R'$ if R can be obtained from R' by some sequence of the following operations:

- permutation of columns;
- pinning (taking sub-relations of the form $R_{i \mapsto c} = \{\bar{a} \in R \mid a_i = c\}$ for some i and some $c \in \{0, 1\}$); and
- projection (“deleting the i th column” to give the relation $\{a_1 \dots a_{i-1} a_{i+1} \dots a_r \mid a_1 \dots a_r \in R\}$).

The three p’s in ppp-definable refer to the initial letters of the words permutation, pinning and projection. Allowing permutation of columns is just a notational convenience: it clearly adds no expressive power.

It is easy to see that $\leq_{\text{ppp}}$ is a partial order on Boolean relations and that, if $R \leq_{\text{ppp}} R'$, then R can be obtained from R' by first permuting the columns, then making some pins and then projecting.

We write $R_{=} = \{00, 11\}$, $R_{\neq} = \{01, 10\}$, $R_{\text{OR}} = \{01, 10, 11\}$, $R_{\text{NAND}} = \{00, 01, 10\}$ and $R_{\rightarrow} = \{00, 01, 11\}$. For $k \geq 2$, we write $R_{=,k} = \{0^k, 1^k\}$, $R_{\text{OR},k} = \{0, 1\}^k \setminus \{0^k\}$ and $R_{\text{NAND},k} = \{0, 1\}^k \setminus \{1^k\}$ (i.e., k -ary equality, OR and NAND).

2.2 Boolean constraint satisfaction problems

A *constraint language* is a set $\Gamma = \{R_1, \dots, R_m\}$ of named Boolean relations. Given a set V of variables, the set of *constraints* over Γ is the set $\text{Cons}(V, \Gamma)$ which contains $R(\bar{v})$ for every relation $R \in \Gamma$ with arity r and every $\bar{v} \in V^r$. Note that, if v and v' are variables, neither $v = v'$ nor $v \neq v'$ is a constraint, though of course $R_{=}(v, v')$ ($R_{\neq}(v, v')$) is a constraint if $R_{=} \in \Gamma$ ($R_{\neq} \in \Gamma$). The *scope* of a constraint $R(\bar{v})$ is the tuple $\bar{v}$. Note that the variables in the scope of a constraint need not all be distinct.

An *instance* of the constraint satisfaction problem (CSP) over Γ is a set V of variables and a set $C \subseteq \text{Cons}(V, \Gamma)$ of constraints.

An *assignment* to a set V of variables is a function $\sigma: V \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$. An assignment to V *satisfies* an instance (V, C) if $\langle \sigma(v_1), \dots, \sigma(v_r) \rangle \in R$ for every constraint of the form $R(v_1, \dots, v_r)$. Given an instance I of some CSP, we write $Z(I)$ for the number of satisfying assignments.

We are interested in the counting CSP problem $\#\text{CSP}(\Gamma)$ (parameterized by Γ), defined as follows:

Input: an instance $I = (V, C)$ of CSP over Γ .

Output: $Z(I)$.

²This should not be confused with the concept of primitive positive definability (pp-definability) which appears in algebraic treatments of CSP and $\#\text{CSP}$, for example in the work of Bulatov [3].

The *degree* of an instance is the greatest number of times any variable appears among its constraints. Note that the variable v appears twice in the constraint $R(v, v)$. Our specific interest in this paper is in classifying the complexity of bounded-degree counting CSPs. For a constraint language Γ and a positive integer d , define $\#\text{CSP}_d(\Gamma)$ to be the restriction of $\#\text{CSP}(\Gamma)$ to instances of degree at most d .

We can deal with instances of degree 1 immediately.

Theorem 1. *For any Γ , $\#\text{CSP}_1(\Gamma) \in \mathbf{FP}$.*

Proof. Because each variable appears at most once, the constraints are independent. Each constraint $R(v_1, \dots, v_r)$ can be satisfied in $|R|$ ways and any variable that does not appear in a constraint can take value either 0 or 1. The total number of assignments is the product of the number of ways each constraint can be satisfied, times 2^k , where k is the number of unconstrained variables. $\square$

When considering bounded-degree CSPs with degree bounds of two or more, it is sometimes useful to simplify the situation by allowing *pinning* in the constraint language [8, 20]. We write $R_{\text{zero}} = \{0\}$ and $R_{\text{one}} = \{1\}$ for the two unary relations that contain only zero and one, respectively. We refer to constraints in R_{zero} and R_{one} as *pins* and we say that the single variable in the scope of a pin is *pinned*. To make notation easier, we will sometimes write constraints using constants instead of explicit pins. That is, we will write constraints of the form $R(x_1, \dots, x_r)$ where each x_i is either a variable from V or a constant 0 or 1 (again, the x_i need not be distinct). Such a constraint can always be rewritten a set of “proper” constraints by replacing each instance of a constant 0 or 1 with a fresh variable v and introducing the appropriate constraint $R_{\text{zero}}(v)$ or $R_{\text{one}}(v)$. Note that every variable introduced in this way appears exactly twice in the resulting instance so if the degree of the CSP instance is at least two, the transformation does not increase the instance’s degree. We let Γ_{pin} denote the constraint language $\{R_{\text{zero}}, R_{\text{one}}\}$.

2.3 Hypergraphs

A *hypergraph* $H = (V, E)$ consists of a set $V = V(H)$ of vertices and a set $E = E(H) \subseteq \mathcal{P}(V)$ of non-empty *hyper-edges*. The *degree* of a vertex $v \in V(H)$ is the number $d(v)$ of hyper-edges it participates in: $d(v) = |\{e \in E(H) \mid v \in e\}|$. The degree of a hypergraph is the maximum degree of its vertices. If $w = \max\{|e| \mid e \in E(H)\}$, we say that H has *width* w .

An *independent set* in a hypergraph H is a set $S \subseteq V(H)$ such that $e \not\subseteq S$ for every $e \in E(H)$. Notice, though, that we may have more than one vertex of a hyper-edge in an independent set, so long as at least one vertex is omitted.

We write $\#w\text{-HIS}$ for the following problem:

Input: a width- w hypergraph H

Output: the number of independent sets in H

and $\#w\text{-HIS}_d$ for the following problem:

Input: a width- w hypergraph H of degree at most d

Output: the number of independent sets in H .

2.4 Approximation complexity

A *randomized approximation scheme* (RAS) for a function $f : \Sigma^* \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ is a probabilistic Turing machine that takes as input a pair $(x, \epsilon) \in \Sigma^* \times (0, 1)$, and produces, on an output tape, an integer random variable Y satisfying the condition $\Pr(e^{-\epsilon} \leq Y/f(x) \leq e^\epsilon) \geq \frac{3}{4}$.³ A *fully polynomial randomized approximation scheme* (FPRAS) is a RAS that runs in time $\text{poly}(|x|, \epsilon^{-1})$.

To compare the complexity of approximate counting problems, we use the AP-reductions of [12]. Suppose f and g are two functions from some input domain Σ^* to the natural numbers and we wish to compare the complexity of approximately computing f to the problem of approximately computing g . An *approximation-preserving* reduction from f to g is a probabilistic oracle Turing machine M that takes as input a pair $(x, \epsilon) \in \Sigma^* \times (0, 1)$, and satisfies the following three conditions: (i) every oracle call made by M is of the form (w, δ) where $w \in \Sigma^*$ is an instance of g , and $0 < \delta < 1$ is an error bound satisfying $\delta^{-1} \leq \text{poly}(|x|, \epsilon^{-1})$; (ii) M is a randomized approximation scheme for f whenever the oracle is a randomized approximation scheme for g ; and (iii) the run-time of M is polynomial in $|x|$ and ϵ^{-1} .

If there is an approximation-preserving reduction from f to g , we write $f \leq_{\text{AP}} g$ and say that f is *AP-reducible* to g . If g has an FPRAS then so does f . If $f \leq_{\text{AP}} g$ and $g \leq_{\text{AP}} f$ then we say that f and g are *AP-interreducible* and write $f \equiv_{\text{AP}} g$.

3 Classes of relations

A relation $R \subseteq \{0, 1\}^r$ is *affine* if it is the set of solutions to some system of linear equations over GF_2 . That is, there is a set Σ of equations in variables $x_1, \dots, x_r$ where each equation has the form $\bigoplus_{i \in I} x_i = c$, where $\oplus$ denotes addition modulo 2, $I \subseteq [1, r]$ and $c \in \{0, 1\}$, and we have $\bar{a} \in R$ if, and only if, the assignment $x_1 \mapsto a_1, \dots, x_r \mapsto a_r$ satisfies every equation in Σ . Note that the empty relation is defined by the equation $0 = 1$ ($\bigoplus_{i \in \emptyset} = 1$) and the complete relation $\{0, 1\}^r$ is defined by the empty set of equations.

If a variable x_i occurs in an equation of the form $x_i = c$, we say that it is *pinned to c* .

³The choice of the value $\frac{3}{4}$ is inconsequential: the same class of problems has an FPRAS if we choose any probability $\frac{1}{2} < p < 1$ [25].

Lemma 2. *Let $R \subseteq \{0, 1\}^r$ be affine. If $R' \leq_{\text{ppp}} R$, then R' is affine.*

Proof. Let R be defined by the set Σ of equations. Clearly, permuting the columns of R just permutes the indices of the variables. For any $i \in [1, r]$ and $c \in \{0, 1\}$, $R_{i \mapsto c}$ is defined by $\Sigma \cup \{x_i = c\}$ so is affine. For projections, let R' be the result of projecting away R 's r -th column. If x_r does not appear in any equation in Σ , then Σ , considered as a set of equations over $x_1, \dots, x_{r-1}$ already defines R' . Otherwise, we may take any equation involving x_r , rewrite it as $x_r = c \oplus \bigoplus_{i \in I \setminus \{r\}} x_i$ and substitute the sum for x_r in every equation where it occurs. The resulting set of equations, in variables $x_1, \dots, x_{r-1}$ defines R' . $\square$

Let OR-conj be the set of Boolean relations that are defined by a conjunction of pins and ORs of any arity and NAND-conj the set of Boolean relations definable by conjunctions of pins and NANDs (i.e., negated conjunctions) of any arity. For example, the relation defined by the formula

$$(x_1 = 0) \wedge (x_2 = 1) \wedge \text{OR}(x_3, x_4, x_5, x_6) \wedge \text{OR}(x_5, x_7)$$

is in OR-conj. We say that one of the defining formulae of these relations is *normalized* if

- no pinned variable appears in any OR or NAND,
- the arguments of each individual OR and NAND are distinct,
- every OR or NAND has at least two arguments and
- no OR or NAND's arguments are a subset of any other's.

Note that the formula in the example above is normalized.

Lemma 3. *Every OR-conj (respectively, NAND-conj) relation is defined by a unique normalized formula.*

Proof. We show the result for OR-conj relations; the case for NAND-conj is similar.

Let R be an OR-conj relation defined by the formula ϕ . The second and subsequent occurrences of any variable within a single clause can be deleted. Any clause that contains a variable pinned to one can be deleted; any variable that is pinned to zero can be deleted from any clause in which it appears. The disjunction $\text{OR}(x)$ is equivalent to pinning x to one. If ϕ contains a clause that is a subset of another, any assignment that satisfies the smaller clause necessarily satisfies the latter, which can, therefore, be deleted. This establishes that every OR-conj relation is defined by at least one normalized formula.

To prove uniqueness, suppose that $R \subseteq \{0, 1\}^r$ is defined by normalized formulae ϕ and ψ . The two formulae must obviously pin the same variables

and we may assume that none are pinned. Consider any clause in ϕ , which we may assume, without loss of generality, to be $\text{OR}(x_1, \dots, x_k)$. Since no clause of ϕ is a subset of $\{x_1, \dots, x_k\}$, every other clause must include at least one variable from $x_{k+1}, \dots, x_r$ and, therefore, $0^{k-1}1^{r-k+1}$ satisfies ϕ and 0^k1^{r-k} does not.

Now, suppose that this clause does not appear in ψ . There are two cases. If ψ contains a clause whose variables are a subset of $\{x_1, \dots, x_k\}$, which we may assume, without loss of generality, to be $\text{OR}(x_1, \dots, x_\ell)$ for some $\ell < k$, then ψ is not satisfied by $0^{k-1}1^{r-k+1}$. Otherwise, every clause of ψ contains at least one variable from $x_{k+1}, \dots, x_r$, so 0^k1^{r-k} satisfies ψ .

In either case, ϕ and ψ define different relations. It follows that every clause that appears in ϕ must also appear in ψ . By symmetry, every clause that appears in ψ must appear in ϕ so the two formulae are identical. $\square$

Given the uniqueness of defining normalized formulae, we define the *width* of an OR-conj or NAND-conj relation R to be $\text{wd}(R)$, the greatest number of arguments to any of the ORs or NANDs in the normalized formula that defines it. Note that, from the definition of normalized formulae, there are no relations of width 1.

We define IM-conj to be the class of relations defined by a conjunction of pins and (binary) implications. This class is called IM_2 in [13]. Say that a conjunction ϕ of pins and implications that defines a relation $R \in \text{IM-conj}$ is *normalized* if no pinned variable appears in an implication and every implication has distinct arguments.

Lemma 4. *Every relation in IM-conj is defined by a normalized formula.*

Proof. Let $R \in \text{IM-conj}$ be defined by the formula ϕ . Any implication $x \rightarrow x$ can be deleted as it does not constrain the value x . If the variable y is pinned to zero then the implication $y \rightarrow z$ can be deleted and the implication $z \rightarrow y$ can be replaced by pinning z to zero. If y is pinned to one, $y \rightarrow z$ can be replaced by pinning z to one and $z \rightarrow y$ can be deleted. Iterating, we can remove all implications involving pinned variables. $\square$

Note that, in contrast to normalized OR-conj and NAND-conj formulae, normalized IM-conj formulae are not necessarily unique. For example, the following three normalized formulae all define the same relation:

$$\begin{aligned} x \rightarrow y \wedge y \rightarrow z \wedge z \rightarrow x \\ x \rightarrow z \wedge z \rightarrow y \wedge y \rightarrow z \\ x \rightarrow y \wedge y \rightarrow x \wedge x \rightarrow z \wedge z \rightarrow x. \end{aligned}$$

3.1 ppp-defining Boolean connectives

Lemma 5. *If $R \in \text{IM-conj}$ is not affine, then $R \rightarrow \leq_{\text{ppp}} R$.*

Proof. Let $R \in \text{IM-conj}$ be defined by the normalized formula ϕ . If there are variables $x_1, \dots, x_r$ such that ϕ contains the implications $x_1 \rightarrow x_2, \dots, x_{r-1} \rightarrow x_r$ and $x_r \rightarrow x_1$ then, in any satisfying assignment for ϕ , the variables $x_1, \dots, x_r$ must take the same value. We may assume, then, that, if ϕ contains such a cycle of implications, it also contains $x_i \rightarrow x_j$ for every distinct pair $x_i, x_j \in \{x_1, \dots, x_r\}$.

There are two cases. First, if ϕ is symmetric (in the sense that, for every implication $x \rightarrow y$ in ϕ , the formula also contains $y \rightarrow x$) then ϕ is equivalent to a conjunction of pins and equalities between variables, so R is affine. Otherwise, there must be at least one pair of variables such that $x \rightarrow y$ is a conjunct of ϕ but $y \rightarrow x$ is not. We ppp-define implication by pinning to zero every unpinned variable z such that there is a chain of implications $z \rightarrow v_1, v_1 \rightarrow v_2, \dots, v_{r-1} \rightarrow v_r, v_r \rightarrow x$ and pinning to one every other unpinned variable apart from x and y . Finally, project out the $r - 2$ constant columns. $\square$

Lemma 6. *If $R \in \text{OR-conj}$ has width w , then $R_{\text{OR},2}, \dots, R_{\text{OR},w} \leq_{\text{ppp}} R$. Similarly, if $R \in \text{NAND-conj}$ has width w , then $R_{\text{NAND},2}, \dots, R_{\text{NAND},w} \leq_{\text{ppp}} R$.*

Proof. Let $R \in \text{OR-conj}$ have arity r and width w . Let R be defined by the normalized formula ϕ which, without loss of generality, we may assume to contain the clause $\text{OR}(x_1, \dots, x_w)$. Since ϕ is normalized, every other clause must contain at least one variable from $x_{w+1}, \dots, x_r$. For any k with $2 \leq k \leq w$, we can ppp-define $R_{\text{OR},k}$ by pinning $x_{k+1}, \dots, x_w$ to zero and pinning $x_{w+1}, \dots, x_r$ to one.

The proof for $R \in \text{NAND-conj}$ is similar. $\square$

3.2 Characterizations

The following proposition establishes a duality between OR-conj and NAND-conj relations. Whenever we say that R is OR-conj or NAND-conj , it is equivalent to say that R or $\tilde{R}$ is OR-conj . (Or, of course, that R or $\tilde{R}$ is NAND-conj .)

Proposition 7. *A relation $R \subseteq \{0, 1\}^r$ is in OR-conj if, and only if, $\tilde{R} \in \text{NAND-conj}$.*

Proof. Suppose R is defined by the normalized formula

$$P \wedge \bigwedge_{1 \leq j \leq m} \bigvee_{i \in I_j} x_i,$$

where P is a conjunction of pins and $I_1, \dots, I_m \subseteq [1, r]$. Then $\tilde{R}$ is defined by the formula

$$P' \wedge \bigwedge_{1 \leq j \leq m} \bigvee_{i \in I_j} \neg x_i,$$

where P' is the conjunction of pins with the opposite values to those in P . This formula is equivalent to

$$P' \wedge \bigwedge_{1 \leq j \leq m} \neg \bigwedge_{i \in I_j} x_i,$$

which is a NAND-conj formula, as required. $\square$

Given tuples $\bar{a}, \bar{b} \in \{0, 1\}^r$, we write $\bar{a} \leq \bar{b}$ if $a_i \leq b_i$ for all $i \in [1, r]$. If $\bar{a} \leq \bar{b}$ and $\bar{a} \neq \bar{b}$, we write $\bar{a} < \bar{b}$.

We say that a relation $R \subseteq \{0, 1\}^r$ is *monotone* if, whenever $\bar{a} \in R$ and $\bar{a} \leq \bar{b}$, then $\bar{b} \in R$. We say that R is *antitone* if, whenever $\bar{a} \in R$ and $\bar{b} \leq \bar{a}$, then $\bar{b} \in R$. That is, changing zeroes to ones in a tuple in a monotone relation gives another tuple in the relation; similarly, antitone relations are preserved by changing ones to zeroes. It is easy to see that R is monotone if, and only if, $\tilde{R}$ is antitone. We say that a relation is *pseudo-monotone* (respectively, *pseudo-antitone*) if its restriction to non-constant columns is monotone (respectively, antitone).

Proposition 8. *A relation $R \subseteq \{0, 1\}^r$ is in OR-conj (respectively, NAND-conj) if, and only if, it is pseudo-monotone (respectively, pseudo-antitone).*

Proof. Suppose $R \in \text{OR-conj}$, defined by some normalized conjunction ϕ of disjunctions and pins. Let $\bar{a} \in R$ and let $\bar{b} \geq \bar{a}$ agree with $\bar{a}$ on all pinned columns. $\bar{a}$ already satisfies every conjunct of ϕ ; $\bar{b}$ satisfies all the pins and assigning 1 to more of the variables cannot cause any of the disjunctions to become unsatisfied.

Towards the converse, suppose that R is (properly) monotone. For any $\bar{a} \in R$, let $I(\bar{a}) = \{i : a_i = 1\}$. By monotonicity, any $\bar{b} \geq \bar{a}$ is in R and to say that $\bar{b} \geq \bar{a}$ is just to say that $b_i = 1$ for every $i \in I(\bar{a})$. So, the formula

$$\phi_{\bar{a}}(\bar{x}) \equiv \bigwedge_{i \in I(\bar{a})} x_i$$

is satisfied by exactly the tuples $\bar{b}$ with $\bar{b} \geq \bar{a}$ and, therefore, R is defined by the formula

$$\phi(\bar{x}) \equiv \bigvee_{\bar{a} \in R} \phi_{\bar{a}}(\bar{x}).$$

This formula is in disjunctive normal form but, since it contains no negations, it is equivalent to a negation-free formula in conjunctive normal form, which is to say, to an OR-conj formula. The case where R is only pseudo-monotone is easily dealt with by using pins for the constant columns.

Finally,

$$\begin{aligned} R \in \text{NAND-conj} &\iff \tilde{R} \in \text{OR-conj} \\ &\iff \tilde{R} \text{ is monotone} \\ &\iff R \text{ is antitone.} \end{aligned}$$

$\square$

4 Simulating equality

An important ingredient in bounded-degree dichotomy theorems [4] is showing how to express equality using constraints from a constraint language that does not necessarily include the equality relation. In this section, we give the definitions that we need and some results about when equality can be expressed in our setting.

Recall that, for all integers $k \geq 2$, $R_{=,k}$ is the k -ary equality relation $\{0^k, 1^k\}$. A constraint language Γ is said to *simulate* $R_{=,k}$ if, for some $\ell \geq k$ there is an integer $m \geq 1$ and a $(\Gamma \cup \Gamma_{\text{pin}})$ -CSP instance I with variables $x_1, \dots, x_\ell$ and such that I has exactly m satisfying assignments σ with $\sigma(x_1) = \dots = \sigma(x_k) = 0$, exactly m with $\sigma(x_1) = \dots = \sigma(x_k) = 1$ and no other satisfying assignments. If, further, the degree of I is d and the degree of each variable $x_1, \dots, x_k$ is at most $d - 1$, we say that Γ *simulates* $R_{=,k}$ *with d variable repetitions* or, for brevity, that Γ *d -simulates* $R_{=,k}$. We say that Γ *d -simulates equality* if it d -simulates $R_{=,k}$ for all $k \geq 2$. If only one relation R is involved in the simulation, we drop the curly brackets and say that R , rather than $\{R\}$, d -simulates equality.

The point of this slightly strange definition is that, if Γ d -simulates equality, we can express the constraint $y_1 = \dots = y_r$ in $\Gamma \cup \Gamma_{\text{pin}}$ and then use each y_i in one further constraint, while still having an instance of degree d . The variables $x_{k+1}, \dots, x_\ell$ in the definition function as auxiliary variables. Since they will not be used in any other constraint, we can use them d times each and still have an instance of degree d .

Proposition 9. *If Γ d -simulates equality, then $\#\text{CSP}(\Gamma) \leq_{\text{AP}} \#\text{CSP}_d(\Gamma \cup \Gamma_{\text{pin}})$.*

Proof. Let I be an instance of $\#\text{CSP}(\Gamma)$. We produce a new CSP instance I' over the constraint language Γ augmented with $R_{=,i}$ constraints for certain values of i as follows. For each variable x that appears $k > d$ times in I , replace the occurrences with new variables $x_1, \dots, x_k$ and add the constraint $R_{=,k}(x_1, \dots, x_k)$. Clearly, $Z(I') = Z(I)$.

Note that every variable in I' either occurs exactly once in an $R_{=,i}$ -constraint and exactly once in a Γ -constraint or occurs in no $R_{=,i}$ constraints and at most d times in Γ -constraints. Since Γ d -simulates equality, we can replace the $R_{=,i}$ -constraints with $(\Gamma \cup \Gamma_{\text{pin}})$ -constraints, using fresh auxiliary variables for each equality to give an instance I'' of $\#\text{CSP}(\Gamma \cup \Gamma_{\text{pin}})$ with degree d . There is some constant m , depending only on the number and arities of the equality constraints in I' , such that $Z(I'') = mZ(I')$. Since m can be computed in polynomial time, we have an AP-reduction. $\square$

Lemma 10. *Let $R \in \{0, 1\}^r$. If $R_{=} \leq_{\text{ppp}} R$, $R_{\neq} \leq_{\text{ppp}} R$ or $R_{\rightarrow} \leq_{\text{ppp}} R$, then R 3-simulates equality.*

Proof. For each $k \geq 2$, we show how to 3-simulate $R_{=,k}$. We may assume without loss of generality that the ppp-definition of $R_{=}$, $R_{\neq}$ or $R_{\rightarrow}$ from R involves applying the identity permutation to the columns, pinning columns 3 to $3+p-1$ inclusive to zero, pinning columns $3+p$ to $3+p+q-1$ inclusive to one (that is, pinning $p \geq 0$ columns to zero and $q \geq 0$ to one) and then projecting away all but the first two columns.

Suppose first that $R_{=} \leq_{\text{ppp}} R$ or $R_{\rightarrow} \leq_{\text{ppp}} R$. R must contain $\alpha \geq 1$ tuples that begin $000^p 1^q$, $\beta \geq 0$ that begin $010^p 1^q$ and $\gamma \geq 1$ that begin $110^p 1^q$, with $\beta = 0$ unless we are ppp-defining $R_{\rightarrow}$.

We consider, first, the case where $\alpha = \gamma$, showing that we can 3-simulate $R_{=,k}$, expressing the constraint $R_{=,k}(x_1, \dots, x_k)$ with the constraints

$$R(x_1 x_2 0^p 1^q *), R(x_2 x_3 0^p 1^q *), \dots, R(x_{k-1} x_k 0^p 1^q *), R(x_k x_1 0^p 1^q *),$$

where $*$ denotes a fresh $(r-2-p-q)$ -tuple of variables in each constraint. This set of constraints is equivalent to either $x_1 = \dots = x_k = x_1$ or $x_1 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow x_k \rightarrow x_1$ so, in either case, constrains the variables $x_1, \dots, x_k$ to have the same value, as required. Every variable appears at most twice and there are α^k solutions to these constraints that put $x_1 = \dots = x_k = 0$, the same number with $x_1 = \dots = x_k = 1$ and no other solutions. Therefore, R 3-simulates $R_{=,k}$, as required.

We now show, by induction on r that we can 3-simulate $R_{=,k}$ even in the case that α is not necessarily equal to γ . For the base case, $r = 2$, we have $\alpha = \gamma = 1$ and we are done. For the inductive step, let $r > 2$ and assume, without loss of generality that $\alpha > \gamma$ (we are already done if $\alpha = \gamma$ and the case $\alpha < \gamma$ is symmetric). In particular, we have $\alpha \geq 2$, so there are distinct tuples $000^p 1^q \bar{a}$ and $000^p 1^q \bar{b}$ in R . R also contains a tuple $110^p 1^q \bar{c}$. Choose j such that $a_j \neq b_j$. Pinning the $(2+p+q+j)$ th column of R to c_j and projecting out the resulting constant column gives a relation of arity $r-1$ that still contains at least one tuple beginning $000^p 1^q$ and at least one beginning $110^p 1^q$: by the inductive hypothesis, this relation 3-simulates $R_{=,k}$.

Finally, we consider the case that $R_{\neq} \leq_{\text{ppp}} R$. R contains $\alpha \geq 1$ tuples beginning $010^p 1^q$ and $\beta \geq 1$ beginning $100^p 1^q$. We express the constraint $R_{=,k}(x_1, \dots, x_k)$ by introducing fresh variables $y_1, \dots, y_k$ and using the constraints

$$\begin{aligned} &R(x_1 y_1 0^p 1^q *), R(y_1, x_2 0^p 1^q *), \\ &R(x_2 y_2 0^p 1^q *), R(y_2, x_3 0^p 1^q *), \\ &\quad \vdots \\ &R(x_{k-1} y_{k-1} 0^p 1^q *), R(y_{k-1}, x_k 0^p 1^q *), \\ &R(x_k y_k 0^p 1^q *), R(y_k, x_1 0^p 1^q *), \end{aligned}$$

where $*$ denotes a fresh $(r-2-p-q)$ -tuple of variables in each constraint, as before. There are $\alpha^k \beta^k$ solutions when $x_1 = \dots = x_k = 0$ (and $y_1 = \dots =$

$y_k = 1$) and $\beta^k \alpha^k$ solutions when the x s are 1 and the y s are 0. There are no other solutions and no variable is used more than twice. $\square$

The following technical lemma and the definitions that support it are used only to prove Lemma 12. For $c \in \{0, 1\}$, an r -ary relation is c -valid if it contains the tuple c^r . Given a relation $R \subseteq \{0, 1\}^r$, a tuple $\bar{a} \in R$ that contains both zeroes and ones and a constant $c \in \{0, 1\}$, let $R_{\bar{a},c}$ be the result of pinning the set of columns $\{i \mid a_i = c\}$ to c and then projecting out those columns. Observe that $R_{\bar{a},c}$ is always $(1-c)$ -valid (because it contains the projection of $\bar{a}$) and is c -valid if R is (because it contains the projection of c^r).

Lemma 11. *Let $r \geq 3$ and let $R_{=,r} \subsetneq R \subsetneq \{0, 1\}^r$. There are $\bar{a} \in R$ and $c \in \{0, 1\}$ such that $R_{\bar{a},c}$ is not complete.*

Proof. Suppose there is a tuple $\bar{a} \in R \setminus \{0^r\}$ such that changing some zero in $\bar{a}$ to a one gives a tuple $\bar{a}' \notin R$. Then $R_{\bar{a},1}$ does not contain the relevant projection of $\bar{a}'$ and we are done. Similarly, if there is a tuple $\bar{b} \in R \setminus \{1^r\}$ that leaves R by changing some one to a zero, then $R_{\bar{b},0}$ is not complete. If no such tuple exists, then either $R = \{0, 1\}^r$ or $R = R_{=,r}$, violating our assumptions. $\square$

Lemma 12. *Let $r \geq 2$ and let $R \subseteq \{0, 1\}^r$ be 0- and 1-valid but not complete. Then R 3-simulates equality.*

Proof. We show by induction on r , which must be at least two, that either $R_{=}$ or $R_{\rightarrow}$ is ppp-definable in R , and the result follows by Lemma 10.

In the case $r = 2$, R is either $R_{=}$, $R_{\rightarrow}$, or $R_{\leftarrow}$ with the columns swapped and we are done. For $r \geq 3$, if $R = R_{=,r}$ then $R_{=}$ is definable by projecting onto the first two columns. Otherwise, by Lemma 11, there is some $\bar{a} \in R$ and $c \in \{0, 1\}$ such that $R_{\bar{a},c}$ is not complete. Since $R_{\bar{a},c} \leq_{\text{ppp}} R$ and is 0- and 1-valid, we are done by the inductive hypothesis. $\square$

We will next show that, if binary OR is ppp-definable in R and binary NAND in R' , then the constraint language $\{R, R'\}$ 3-simulates equality (R and R' need not be distinct). To do this, we will use the following sets of constraints, ξ_k , for $k \geq 2$:

$$\begin{aligned} \xi_k = & \{R_{\text{OR}}(x_i, y_i) \mid 1 \leq i \leq k\} \cup \\ & \{R_{\text{NAND}}(y_i, x_{i+1}) \mid 1 \leq i < k\} \cup \{R_{\text{NAND}}(y_k, x_1)\}. \end{aligned}$$

The key point about these constraints is that they show that the language $\{R_{\text{OR}}, R_{\text{NAND}}\}$ 3-simulates equality.

Lemma 13. *Let $\sigma: \{x_1, \dots, x_k, y_1, \dots, y_k\} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^{2k}$. σ satisfies ξ_k if, and only if*

$$\sigma(x_1) = \dots = \sigma(x_k) \neq \sigma(y_1) = \dots = \sigma(y_k).$$

Proof. It is easy to check that assignments of the given type satisfy ξ_k . Conversely, suppose that σ satisfies ξ_k .

If $\sigma(x_1) = 0$, we have $\sigma(y_1) = 1$ because $R_{\text{OR}}(x_1, y_1)$ is satisfied and we must have $\sigma(x_2) = 0$ because $R_{\text{NAND}}(y_1, x_2)$ is satisfied. By a trivial induction, $\sigma(x_i) = 0$ and $\sigma(y_i) = 1$ for all i .

Otherwise, $\sigma(x_1) = 1$. If $\sigma(x_i) = 0$ for any $i > 1$ then, by the same argument as above, $\sigma(x_i) = 0$ for all $i \in [1, k]$, contradicting the assumption that $\sigma(x_1) = 1$. Therefore, $\sigma(x_i) = 1$ for all i . In order to satisfy the constraints $R_{\text{NAND}}(y_i, x_{i+1})$, we must have $\sigma(y_i) = 0$ for all i . $\square$

We now show that, in fact, we do not need to have R_{OR} and R_{NAND} in our constraint language Γ : it suffices to be able to ppp-define them from relations in Γ .

Lemma 14. *If $R_{\text{OR}} \leq_{\text{ppp}} R$ and $R_{\text{NAND}} \leq_{\text{ppp}} R'$ then $\{R, R'\}$ 3-simulates equality.*

Proof. Suppose first that R and R' are two distinct relations. We may assume, as in the proof of Lemma 10, that the ppp-definition of R_{OR} from R involves performing some permutation and projecting to the first two columns after pinning the next p columns to zero and the q columns after that to one. We may suppose further that it is not possible to pin any more columns of R and still ppp-define R_{OR} . Without loss of generality, we may assume the permutation to be the identity.

Under these assumptions, R contains $\alpha \geq 1$ tuples beginning $010^p 1^q$, $\beta \geq 1$ tuples beginning $100^p 1^q$ and $\gamma \geq 1$ tuples beginning $110^p 1^q$, but none beginning $000^p 1^q$. We first show that, if $\alpha \neq \beta$, then we are done because $R_{\neq} \leq_{\text{ppp}} R$, which means that R 3-simulates equality by Lemma 10.

To this end, suppose $\alpha > \beta$ so, in particular, $\alpha \geq 2$ and there are distinct tuples $010^p 1^q \bar{a}$ and $010^p 1^q \bar{b}$ in R . We may assume, without loss of generality, that $a_1 \neq b_1$. Since $\beta \geq 1$, there is at least one tuple $100^p 1^q \bar{c} \in R$. Suppose, now that we pin the $(2 + p + q + 1)$ th column of R to c_1 . R cannot contain any tuple $110^p 1^q \bar{d}$ with $d_1 = c_1$ because it is not possible to pin more columns and still ppp-define R_{OR} . But then R contains tuples beginning with each of $010^p 1^q c_1$ and $100^p 1^q c_1$ and none beginning $000^p 1^q c_1$ or $110^p 1^q c_1$, so $R_{\neq} \leq_{\text{ppp}} R$. We similarly have $R_{\neq} \leq_{\text{ppp}} R$ if $\alpha < \beta$. From this point, we may assume that $\alpha = \beta$.

Similarly, either $R_{\neq} \leq_{\text{ppp}} R'$, in which case, we are done, or R' contains α' tuples beginning with each of $010^{p'} 1^{q'}$ and $100^{p'} 1^{q'}$, γ' tuples beginning $000^{p'} 1^{q'}$ and no tuples beginning $110^{p'} 1^{q'}$.

We now show how to simulate equality. We can 3-simulate $R_{=,k}$ by replacing the constraint $R_{=,k}(x_1, \dots, x_k)$ with the following set of constraints,

modelled on ξ_k :

$$\begin{aligned} \Xi_k = & \{R(x_i y_i 0^p 1^q *) \mid 1 \leq i \leq k\} \cup \\ & \{R'(y_i x_{i+1} 0^{p'} 1^{q'} *) \mid 1 \leq i < k\} \cup \{R'(y_k x_1 0^{p'} 1^{q'} *)\}, \end{aligned}$$

where the y_i are fresh variables and, as before, $*$ denotes a fresh tuple of variables for each constraint, of the appropriate length. By Lemma 13, an assignment σ satisfies Ξ_k if, and only if

$$\sigma(x_1) = \dots = \sigma(x_k) \neq \sigma(y_1) = \dots = \sigma(y_k).$$

Further, there are α ways to satisfy the variables denoted by $*$ in each R constraint and α' ways in each R' constraint. Therefore, there are $(\alpha\alpha')^k$ satisfying assignments for Ξ_k corresponding to each satisfying assignment for $R_{=,k}$ and we are done.

Notice that our assumption that the ppp-definition of R_{OR} in R and R_{NAND} in R' involve the identity permutation, pinning sequential columns to zero and one and projecting to the first two columns only for the notational convenience of referring to “tuples beginning $010^p 1^q$ ” and so on. This being the case, there is no requirement that R and R' be distinct, so the proof is complete. $\square$

Note that there are relations, such as $R_{=,3}$ that 2-simulate equality, though we do not require this, here, so we omit the proof.

5 Classifying relations

We are now ready to prove that every Boolean relation R is in OR-conj, in NAND-conj or 3-simulates equality. Given r -ary relations R_0 and R_1 , we write $R_0 + R_1$ for the relation $\{0\bar{a} \mid \bar{a} \in R_0\} \cup \{1\bar{a} \mid \bar{a} \in R_1\}$. The proof of the classification is by induction on the arity of R and proceeds by decomposing R as $R_0 + R_1$.

Lemma 15. *Let $R_0, R_1 \in \text{OR-conj}$ and let $R = R_0 + R_1$. Then $R \in \text{OR-conj}$, $R \in \text{NAND-conj}$ or R 3-simulates equality.*

Proof. Let R_0 and R_1 have arity r . We may assume that R has no constant columns. If it does, let R' be the relation that results from projecting away all the constant columns. Then $R' = R'_0 + R'_1$, where both R'_0 and R'_1 are OR-conj relations. By the remainder of the proof, $R' \in \text{OR-conj}$, $R' \in \text{NAND-conj}$ or R' 3-simulates equality. Re-instating the constant columns does not alter this.

For R with no constant columns, there are two cases.

Case 1. $R_0 \subseteq R_1$. Suppose R_i is defined by the normalized OR-conj formula ϕ_i in variables $x_2 \dots x_{r+1}$. Then R is defined by the formula

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_0 \vee (x_1 = 1 \wedge \phi_1) &\equiv (\phi_0 \vee x_1 = 1) \wedge (\phi_0 \vee \phi_1) \\ &\equiv (\phi_0 \vee x_1 = 1) \wedge \phi_1, \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

where the first equivalence is the distribution law and the second is because ϕ_0 implies ϕ_1 (because $R_0 \subseteq R_1$). Note that R_1 cannot have any constant columns, since a constant column in R_1 would have to be constant with the same value in R_0 , contradicting our assumption that R itself has no constant columns. We consider the following two cases.

Case 1.1. R_0 has no constant columns. Since $x_1 = 1$ is equivalent to $\text{OR}(x_1)$ and ϕ_0 does not contain any pins, we can rewrite $\phi_0 \vee x_1 = 1$ in CNF, and hence the formula (1) defines an OR-conj relation.

Case 1.2. R_0 has a constant column. As argued above, the corresponding column of R_1 cannot be constant. Suppose first that there is a constant column of R_0 , say the k th column, that contains only zeros. Then the projection of R onto its first and $(k+1)$ st columns gives the relation $R_{\rightarrow}$ (with reversed columns), so R 3-simulates equality by Lemma 10. Suppose second that all constant columns of R_0 contain ones. Then ϕ_0 is in CNF since every pinning $x_i = 1$ in ϕ_0 can be written $\text{OR}(x_i)$. We can therefore rewrite $\phi_0 \vee x_1 = 1$ in CNF, and hence the formula (1) defines an OR-conj relation.

Case 2. $R_0 \not\subseteq R_1$. We will show that R 3-simulates equality or is in NAND-conj. We consider two cases (recall that no relation has width 1).

Case 2.1. At least one of R_0 and R_1 has positive width. We consider the following two cases.

Case 2.1.1. R_1 has a constant column. Suppose the k th column of R_1 is constant. If the k th column of R_0 is also constant, then the projection of R to its first and $(k+1)$ st columns is either equality or disequality (since the corresponding column of R is not constant) so R 3-simulates equality by Lemma 10. Otherwise, if the projection of R to the first and $(k+1)$ st columns is $R_{\rightarrow}$, then R 3-simulates equality by Lemma 10. Otherwise, that projection must be R_{NAND} . By Lemma 6 and the assumption of Case 2.1, R_{OR} is ppp-definable in at least one of R_0 and R_1 so R 3-simulates equality by Lemma 14.

Case 2.1.2. R_1 has no constant columns. By Proposition 8, R_1 is monotone. Let $\bar{a} \in R_0 \setminus R_1$: by applying the same permutation to the columns of R_0 and R_1 , we may assume that $\bar{a} = 0^\ell 1^{r-\ell}$. We must have $\ell \geq 1$ as every non-empty r -ary monotone relation contains the tuple 1^r . Let $\bar{b} \in R_1$ be a tuple such that $a_i = b_i$ for a maximal initial segment of $[1, r]$. By monotonicity of R_1 , we may assume that $\bar{b} = 0^k 1^{r-k}$. Further, we must

have $k < \ell$, since, otherwise, we would have $\bar{b} < \bar{a}$, contradicting our choice of $\bar{a} \notin R_1$.

Now, consider the relation

$$R' = \{a_0 a_1 \dots a_{\ell-k} \mid a_0 0^k a_1 \dots a_{\ell-k} 1^{r-\ell} \in R\},$$

which is the result of pinning columns 2 to $(k+1)$ of R to zero and columns $(r-\ell+1)$ to $(r+1)$ to one and discarding the resulting constant columns. R' contains $0^{\ell-k+1}$ and $1^{\ell-k+1}$ but is not complete, since it does not contain $10^{\ell-k}$. By Lemma 12, R' and, hence, R 3-simulates equality.

Case 2.2. Both R_0 and R_1 have width zero, i.e., are complete relations, possibly padded with constant columns. For $i \in [1, r]$, let R'_i be the relation obtained from R by projecting onto its first and $(i+1)$ st columns. Since R has no constant columns, R'_i is either complete, $R_=$, $R_{\neq}$, R_{OR} , R_{NAND} , $R_{\rightarrow}$ or the bit-wise complement of $R_{\rightarrow}$. If there is a k such that R'_k is $R_=$, $R_{\neq}$, $R_{\rightarrow}$ or the bit-wise complement of $R_{\rightarrow}$, then $R_=$, $R_{\neq}$ or $R_{\rightarrow}$ is ppp-definable in R and hence R 3-simulates equality by Lemma 10. If there are k_1 and k_2 such that $R'_{k_1} = R_{\text{OR}}$ and $R'_{k_2} = R_{\text{NAND}}$ then R 3-simulates equality by Lemma 14. It remains to consider the following two cases.

Case 2.2.1. Each R'_i is either R_{OR} or complete. R_1 must be complete, which contradicts the assumption that $R_0 \not\subseteq R_1$.

Case 2.2.1. Each R'_i is either R_{NAND} or complete. R_0 must be complete. Let $I = \{i \mid R'_i = R_{\text{NAND}}\}$. Then

$$R = \bigwedge_{i \in I} \text{NAND}(x_1, x_{i+1}),$$

so $R \in \text{NAND-conj}$. □

The following corollary follows from Proposition 7 and the facts that $\widetilde{R_0 + R_1} = \widetilde{R_1} + \widetilde{R_0}$ and that, if $\widetilde{R}$ 3-defines equality, then so does R (since the equality relation is its own bit-wise complement).

Corollary 16. Let $R_0, R_1 \in \text{NAND-conj}$ and let $R = R_0 + R_1$. Then $R \in \text{OR-conj}$, $R \in \text{NAND-conj}$ or R 3-simulates equality.

Theorem 17. Every Boolean relation is in OR-conj , is in NAND-conj or 3-simulates equality.

Proof. Induction on the arity, r . Every relation of arity less than two is both in OR-conj and in NAND-conj ; similarly, every relation of arity two that has at least one constant column or is complete. The only other binary relations are R_{OR} , which is OR-conj , R_{NAND} , which is NAND-conj , and $R_=$, $R_{\neq}$, $R_{\rightarrow}$ and its bit-wise complement, all of which 3-simulate equality by Lemma 10.

For the inductive step, let R be a relation of arity $r + 1 > 2$ and let R_0 and R_1 be such that $R = R_0 + R_1$. By the inductive hypothesis, each of R_0 and R_1 is in OR-conj, in NAND-conj or 3-simulates equality.

If either of R_0 and R_1 3-simulates equality, then so does R . Otherwise, either both are in OR-conj, both are in NAND-conj or exactly one is in OR-conj and exactly one is in NAND-conj. In the first case, R is in OR-conj or in NAND-conj or 3-simulates equality by Lemma 15; in the second case, R is in OR-conj or in NAND-conj or 3-simulates equality by Corollary 16; and, in the third case, R simulates equality by Lemma 14. $\square$

6 Complexity

The complexity of approximating $\#CSP(\Gamma)$ where the degree of instances is unbounded is given by Dyer, Goldberg and Jerrum.

Theorem 18 ([13, Theorem 3]). *Let Γ be a Boolean constraint language.*

- *If every $R \in \Gamma$ is affine, then $\#CSP(\Gamma) \in \mathbf{FP}$.*
- *Otherwise, if $\Gamma \subseteq IM\text{-conj}$, then $\#CSP(\Gamma) \equiv_{AP} \#BIS$.*
- *Otherwise, $\#CSP(\Gamma) \equiv_{AP} \#SAT$.*

Working towards our classification of the approximation complexity of $\#CSP(\Gamma)$, we first deal with subcases.

Proposition 19. *If $\Gamma \subseteq IM\text{-conj}$ contains at least one non-affine relation, then $\#CSP_d(\Gamma \cup \Gamma_{pin}) \equiv_{AP} \#BIS$ for all $d \geq 3$.*

Proof. It is immediate from [13, Lemma 9] that $\#CSP_d(\Gamma \cup \Gamma_{pin}) \leq_{AP} \#BIS$.

For the converse, first observe that, by [13, Lemma 8], $\#BIS \leq_{AP} \#CSP(\{R_{\rightarrow}\})$ and, since $R_{\rightarrow}$ 3-simulates equality by Lemma 10, we have $\#CSP(\{R_{\rightarrow}\}) \leq_{AP} \#CSP_d(\{R_{\rightarrow}\} \cup \Gamma_{pin})$ for all $d \geq 3$ by Proposition 9. It remains to show that $\#CSP_d(\{R_{\rightarrow}\} \cup \Gamma_{pin}) \leq_{AP} \#CSP_d(\Gamma \cup \Gamma_{pin})$.

To this end, let R be any non-affine relation in Γ . By Lemma 5, $R_{\rightarrow} \leq_{ppp} R$ and the ppp-definition involves projecting only pinned columns. Therefore, we can express the constraint $R_{\rightarrow}(x, y)$ by a constraint of the form $R(v_1, \dots, v_r)$, where, for some i and j , $v_i = x$ and $v_j = y$ and the other variables are pinned to zero or one. $\square$

Lemma 20. *For $d \geq 2$ and $w \geq 2$, $\#w\text{-HIS}_d \equiv_{AP} \#CSP_d(\{R_{OR,w}\} \cup \Gamma_{pin}) \equiv_{AP} \#CSP_d(\{R_{NAND,w}\} \cup \Gamma_{pin})$.*

Proof. The second equivalence is trivial, since $R_{OR,w}$ and $R_{NAND,w}$ are bit-wise-complementary.

For the first equivalence, let H be an instance of $\#w\text{-HIS}_d$. We create an instance of $\#CSP_d(\{R_{OR,w}\} \cup \Gamma_{pin})$ as follows. The variables are

$\{x_v \mid v \in V(H)\}$ and, for each hyper-edge $\{v_1, \dots, v_s\}$, there is a constraint $R_{\text{OR},w}(x_{v_1}, \dots, x_{v_s}, 0, \dots, 0)$. Each vertex appears in at most d hyper-edges so each variable appears in at most d constraints. It is easy to see that a configuration σ of the resulting $\#\text{CSP}_d(\{R_{\text{OR},w}\} \cup \Gamma_{\text{pin}})$ instance is satisfying if, and only if, $\{v \mid \sigma(x_v) = 0\}$ is an independent set in H .

Conversely, if we are given an instance of $\#\text{CSP}_d(\{R_{\text{OR},w}\} \cup \Gamma_{\text{pin}})$, we create an instance H of $\#w\text{-HIS}_d$ as follows. There is a vertex v_x for every variable x . For every constraint $R_{\text{OR},w}(x_1, \dots, x_w)$ (where the x_i are not necessarily distinct), add the hyper-edge $\{v_{x_1}, \dots, v_{x_w}\}$. Now, for every constraint $R_{\text{zero}}(x)$, delete the vertex v_x and remove it from every hyper-edge that contains it. For every constraint $R_{\text{one}}(x)$, delete v_x and delete every hyper-edge that contains it. It is easy to see that a configuration σ is satisfying if, and only if, it satisfies the pins and the set $\{v_x \mid \sigma(x) = 0\} \cap V(H)$ is independent in H . $\square$

In the following two propositions, we just prove the OR-conj cases; the NAND-conj cases are equivalent.

Proposition 21. *Let R be an OR-conj or NAND-conj relation of width w . Then for $d \geq 2$, $\#w\text{-HIS}_d \leq_{\text{AP}} \#\text{CSP}_d(\{R\} \cup \Gamma_{\text{pin}})$.*

Proof. By Lemma 6, $R_{\text{OR},w} \leq_{\text{ppp}} R$ and the ppp definition involves pinning and then projecting away all but w of the columns. Thus, a $R_{\text{OR},w}$ -constraint can be simulated by an R -constraint in which some elements of the scope are constants. The result follows from Lemma 20. $\square$

Proposition 22. *Let R be an OR-conj or NAND-conj relation of width w . Then for $d \geq 2$, $\#\text{CSP}_d(\{R\} \cup \Gamma_{\text{pin}}) \leq_{\text{AP}} \#w\text{-HIS}_{kd}$, where k is the greatest number of times that any variable appears in the normalized formula defining R .*

Proof. Given an instance I of $\#\text{CSP}_d(\{R\} \cup \Gamma_{\text{pin}})$, we produce an instance I' of the problem $\#\text{CSP}(\{R_{\text{OR},2}, \dots, R_{\text{OR},w}\} \cup \Gamma_{\text{pin}})$ with the same variables by replacing every R -constraint with the $R_{\text{OR},i}$ -constraints and pins corresponding to the normalized formula that defines R . Clearly, $Z(I) = Z(I')$ but a variable that appeared d times in I might appear kd times in I' , so we have established that $\#\text{CSP}_d(\{R\} \cup \Gamma_{\text{pin}}) \leq_{\text{AP}} \#\text{CSP}_{kd}(\{R_{\text{OR},2}, \dots, R_{\text{OR},w}\} \cup \Gamma_{\text{pin}}) \leq_{\text{AP}} \#\text{CSP}_{kd}(\{R_{\text{OR},w}\} \cup \Gamma_{\text{pin}})$, where the last reduction follows the fact that an $R_{\text{OR},w}$ -constraint with zero-pins can replace any $R_{\text{OR},s}$ -constraint for $s < w$. By Lemma 20, $\#\text{CSP}_{kd}(\{R_{\text{OR},w}\} \cup \Gamma_{\text{pin}}) \equiv_{\text{AP}} \#w\text{-HIS}_{kd}$. $\square$

We now give the complexity of approximating $\#\text{CSP}_d(\Gamma \cup \Gamma_{\text{pin}})$ for $d \geq 3$.

Theorem 23. *Let Γ be a Boolean constraint language and let $d \geq 3$.*

- *If every $R \in \Gamma$ is affine, then $\#\text{CSP}_d(\Gamma \cup \Gamma_{\text{pin}}) \in \mathbf{FP}$.*

- Otherwise, if $\Gamma \subseteq \text{IM-conj}$, then $\#\text{CSP}_d(\Gamma \cup \Gamma_{\text{pin}}) \equiv_{\text{AP}} \#\text{BIS}$.
- Otherwise, if $\Gamma \subseteq \text{OR-conj}$ or $\Gamma \subseteq \text{NAND-conj}$, then let w be the greatest width of any relation in Γ and let k be the greatest number of times that any variable appears in the normalized formulae defining the relations of Γ . Then $\#w\text{-HIS}_d \leq_{\text{AP}} \#\text{CSP}_d(\Gamma \cup \Gamma_{\text{pin}}) \leq_{\text{AP}} \#w\text{-HIS}_{kd}$.
- Otherwise, $\#\text{CSP}_d(\Gamma \cup \Gamma_{\text{pin}}) \equiv_{\text{AP}} \#\text{SAT}$.

Proof. The affine case follows immediately from Theorem 18. Note that $\Gamma \cup \Gamma_{\text{pin}}$ is affine if, and only if Γ is.

Otherwise, suppose $\Gamma \subseteq \text{IM-conj}$ and some $R \in \Gamma$ is not affine. By Proposition 19, $\#\text{CSP}_d(\Gamma \cup \Gamma_{\text{pin}}) \equiv_{\text{AP}} \#\text{BIS}$.

Otherwise, suppose that $\Gamma \subseteq \text{OR-conj}$ or $\Gamma \subseteq \text{NAND-conj}$. Then $\#w\text{-HIS}_d \leq_{\text{AP}} \#\text{CSP}_d(\Gamma \cup \Gamma_{\text{pin}}) \leq_{\text{AP}} \#w\text{-HIS}_{kd}$ by Propositions 21 and 22.

Finally, suppose that Γ is not affine, $\Gamma \not\subseteq \text{IM-conj}$, $\Gamma \not\subseteq \text{OR-conj}$ and $\Gamma \not\subseteq \text{NAND-conj}$. Since $(\Gamma \cup \Gamma_{\text{pin}})$ is neither affine or a subset of IM-conj , we have $\#\text{CSP}(\Gamma \cup \Gamma_{\text{pin}}) \equiv_{\text{AP}} \#\text{SAT}$ by Theorem 18 so, if we can show that Γ d -simulates equality, then $\#\text{CSP}_d(\Gamma \cup \Gamma_{\text{pin}}) \equiv_{\text{AP}} \#\text{CSP}(\Gamma \cup \Gamma_{\text{pin}})$ by Proposition 9 and we are done. If Γ contains a R relation that is neither OR-conj nor NAND-conj , then R 3-simulates equality by Theorem 17. Otherwise, Γ must contain distinct relations $R_1 \in \text{OR-conj}$ and $R_2 \in \text{NAND-conj}$ that are non-affine so have width at least two. So Γ 3-simulates equality by Lemma 14. $\square$

Dyer, Frieze and Jerrum have shown that no FPRAS can exist for the problem of counting independent sets in graphs of maximum degree at least 25, unless $\mathbf{NP} = \mathbf{RP}$ [11]. Clearly, if there is no FPRAS for the problem of counting independent sets in such graphs, there can be no FPRAS for $\#w\text{-HIS}_d$ with $r \geq 2$ and $d \geq 25$. Further, since $\#\text{SAT}$ is complete for $\#\mathbf{P}$ with respect to AP-reducibility [12], $\#\text{SAT}$ cannot have an FPRAS unless $\mathbf{NP} = \mathbf{RP}$. From Theorem 23 above we have the following corollary.

Corollary 24. *Let Γ be a Boolean constraint language and let $d \geq 25$.*

- *If every $R \in \Gamma$ is affine, then $\#\text{CSP}_d(\Gamma \cup \Gamma_{\text{pin}}) \in \mathbf{FP}$.*
- *Otherwise, if $\Gamma \subseteq \text{IM-conj}$, then $\#\text{CSP}_d(\Gamma \cup \Gamma_{\text{pin}}) \equiv_{\text{AP}} \#\text{BIS}$.*
- *Otherwise there is no FPRAS for $\#\text{CSP}_d(\Gamma \cup \Gamma_{\text{pin}})$, unless $\mathbf{NP} = \mathbf{RP}$.*

Note that $\Gamma \cup \Gamma_{\text{pin}}$ is affine (respectively, in OR-conj or in NAND-conj) if, and only if Γ is. Therefore, the case for large-degree instances ($d \geq 25$) corresponds exactly in complexity to the unbounded case [13].

The case for lower degree bounds is more complex. To put Theorem 23 in context, we give a summary of what is known about the approximability of $\#w\text{-HIS}_d$ for various values of d and w .

The case $d = 1$ is clearly in $\mathbf{FP}$ (Theorem 1) and so is the case $d = w = 2$, which corresponds to counting independent sets in graphs of maximum

Degree d	Width w	Approximability of $\#w\text{-HIS}_d$
1	≥ 2	FP
2	2	FP
2	≥ 3	FPRAS [17]
3	2, 3	FPRAS [17]
3, 4, 5	2	PTAS [36]
6, $\dots$, 24	≥ 2	The MCMC method is likely to fail [11]
≥ 25	≥ 2	No FPRAS unless NP = RP [11]

Table 1: A summary of known approximability of $\#w\text{-HIS}_d$. For values of d and w not covered by the table, the approximability is still unknown.

degree two. For $d = 2$ and width $w \geq 3$, Dyer and Greenhill have shown that there is an FPRAS for $\#w\text{-HIS}_d$ [17]. For $d = 3$, they have shown that there is an FPRAS if the width w is at most 3. For larger width, the approximability of $\#w\text{-HIS}_3$ is still not known. With the width restricted to $w = 2$ (normal graphs), Weitz has shown that, for degree $d \in \{3, 4, 5\}$, there is a deterministic approximation scheme that runs in polynomial time (a PTAS) [36]. This extends a result of Luby and Vigoda, who gave an FPRAS for $d \leq 4$ [30]. For $d > 5$, approximating $\#w\text{-HIS}_d$ becomes considerably harder. More precisely, Dyer, Frieze and Jerrum have shown that for $d = 6$ the Monte Carlo Markov chain technique is likely to fail, in the sense that “cautious” Markov chains are provably slowly mixing [11]. They also showed that, for $d = 25$, there can be no polynomial-time algorithm for approximate counting, unless **NP** = **RP**. These results imply that for $d \in \{6, \dots, 24\}$ and $w \geq 2$ the Monte Carlo Markov chain technique is likely to fail and for $d \geq 25$ and $w \geq 2$, there can be no FPRAS unless **NP** = **RP**. Table 1 summarizes the results.

Returning to bounded-degree $\#\text{CSP}$, the case $d = 2$ seems to have a rather different flavour to degree bounds three and higher. This is also the case for decision CSP — recall that the complexity of degree- d $\text{CSP}(\Gamma \cup \Gamma_{\text{pin}})$ is the same as unbounded-degree $\text{CSP}(\Gamma \cup \Gamma_{\text{pin}})$ for all $d \geq 3$ [8], while degree-2 $\text{CSP}(\Gamma \cup \Gamma_{\text{pin}})$ is often easier than the unbounded-degree case [8, 20] but there are still constraint languages Γ for which the complexity of degree-2 $\text{CSP}(\Gamma \cup \Gamma_{\text{pin}})$ is open.

Our key techniques for determining the complexity of $\#\text{CSP}_d(\Gamma \cup \Gamma_{\text{pin}})$ for $d \geq 3$ were the 3-simulation of equality and Theorem 17, which says that every Boolean relation is in **OR-conj**, in **NAND-conj** or 3-simulates equality. However, it seems that not all relations that 3-simulate equality also 2-simulate equality so the corresponding classification of relations does not appear to hold. It seems that different techniques will be required for the degree-2 case. For example, it is possible that there is no FPRAS for

$\#\text{CSP}_3(\Gamma \cup \Gamma_{\text{pin}})$ except when Γ is affine. However, Bubley and Dyer have shown that there is an FPRAS for the restriction of $\#\text{SAT}$ in which each variable appears at most twice, even though the exact counting problem is $\#\mathbf{P}$ -complete [1]. This shows that there is a class $\mathcal{C}$ of constraint languages for which $\#\text{CSP}_2(\Gamma \cup \Gamma_{\text{pin}})$ has an FPRAS for every $\Gamma \in \mathcal{C}$ but for which no exact polynomial-time algorithm is known.

We leave the complexity of degree-2 $\#\text{CSP}$ and of $\#\text{BIS}$ and the various parameterized versions of the counting hypergraph independent sets problem as open questions for future research.

References

- [1] R. Bubley and M. Dyer. Graph orientations with no sink and an approximation for a hard case of $\#\text{SAT}$. In *8th ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA 1997)*, pages 248–257, 1997.
- [2] A. A. Bulatov. A dichotomy theorem for constraint satisfaction problems on a 3-element domain. *Journal of the ACM*, 53(1):66–120, 2006.
- [3] A. A. Bulatov. The complexity of the counting constraint satisfaction problem. In *35th International Colloquium on Automata, Languages and Programming (ICALP 2008) Part I*, volume 5125 of *LNCS*, pages 646–661. Springer, 2008.
- [4] J.-Y. Cai, P. Lu, and M. Xia. The complexity of complex weighted Boolean $\#\text{CSP}$. Upcoming journal submission, 2009.
- [5] B. Courcelle. Graph rewriting: An algebraic and logic approach. In J. van Leeuwen, editor, *Handbook of Theoretical Computer Science*, pages 194–242. Elsevier, 1990.
- [6] B. Courcelle, J. A. Makowski, and U. Rotics. On the fixed parameter complexity of graph enumeration problems definable in monadic second order logic. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 108(1–2):23–52, 2001.
- [7] N. Creignou and M. Hermann. Complexity of generalized satisfiability counting problems. *Information and Computation*, 125(1):1–12, 1996.
- [8] V. Dalmau and D. K. Ford. Generalized satisfiability with limited occurrences per variable: A study through Delta-matroid parity. In *Mathematical Foundations of Computer Science (MFCS 2003)*, volume 2747 of *LNCS*, pages 358–367. Springer, 2003.
- [9] R. Dechter and J. Pearl. Tree clustering for constraint networks. *Artificial Intelligence*, 38(3):353–366, 1989.

- [10] J. Díaz, M. Serna, and D. M. Thilikos. Counting h -colorings of partial k -trees. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 281(1–2):291–309, 2002.
- [11] M. Dyer, A. Frieze, and M. Jerrum. On counting independent sets in sparse graphs. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 31(5):1527–1541, 2002.
- [12] M. Dyer, L. A. Goldberg, C. S. Greenhill, and M. Jerrum. The relative complexity of approximate counting problems. *Algorithmica*, 38(3):471–500, 2003.
- [13] M. Dyer, L. A. Goldberg, and M. Jerrum. An approximation trichotomy for Boolean $\#$ CSP. To appear in *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*. <http://arxiv.org/abs/0710.4272>, 2007.
- [14] M. Dyer, L. A. Goldberg, and M. Jerrum. The complexity of weighted Boolean CSP. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 38(5):1970–1986, 2009.
- [15] M. Dyer, L. A. Goldberg, and M. Paterson. On counting homomorphisms to directed acyclic graphs. *Journal of the ACM*, 54(6), 2007.
- [16] M. Dyer and C. S. Greenhill. The complexity of counting graph homomorphisms. *Random Structures and Algorithms*, 17(3–4):260–289, 2000. (Corrigendum in *Random Structures and Algorithms*, 25(3):346–352, 2004.).
- [17] M. Dyer and C. S. Greenhill. On Markov chains for independent sets. *Journal of Algorithms*, 35(1):17–49, 2000.
- [18] R. Fagin. Monadic generalized spectra. *Zeitschrift für Mathematische Logik und Grundlagen der Mathematik*, 21:89–96, 1975.
- [19] R. Fagin, L. J. Stockmeyer, and M. Y. Vardi. On monadic NP vs monadic co-NP. *Information and Computation*, 120(1):78–92, 1995.
- [20] T. Feder. Fanout limitations on constraint systems. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 255(1–2):281–293, 2001.
- [21] T. Feder and M. Y. Vardi. The computational structure of monotone monadic SNP and constraint satisfaction: A study through Datalog and group theory. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 28(1):57–104, 1998.
- [22] E. C. Freuder. Complexity of k -tree structured constraint satisfaction problems. In *8th Conference of the American Association for Artificial Intelligence*, pages 4–9. AAAI Press/MIT Press, 1990.
- [23] P. Hell and J. Nešetřil. On the complexity of h -coloring. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B*, 48(1):92–110, 1990.

- [24] P. Hell and J. Nešetřil. *Graphs and Homomorphisms*. Oxford University Press, 2004.
- [25] M. Jerrum, L. G. Valiant, and V. V. Vazirani. Random generation of combinatorial structures from a uniform distribution. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 43:169–188, 1986.
- [26] Ph. G. Kolaitis and M. Y. Vardi. Conjunctive query containment and constraint satisfaction. *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*, 61(2):302–332, 2000.
- [27] Ph. G. Kolaitis and M. Y. Vardi. A game-theoretic approach to constraint satisfaction. In *17th Conference of the American Association for Artificial Intelligence*, pages 175–181. AAAI Press/MIT Press, 2000.
- [28] V. Kumar. Algorithms for constraint satisfaction problems: A survey. *AI Magazine*, 13(1):33–42, 1992.
- [29] R. E. Ladner. On the structure of polynomial time reducibility. *Journal of the ACM*, 22(1):155–171, 1975.
- [30] M. Luby and E. Vigoda. Fast convergence of the Glauber dynamics for sampling independent sets. *Random Structures and Algorithms*, 15(3–4):229–241, 1999.
- [31] U. Montanari. Networks of constraints: Fundamental properties and applications to picture processing. *Information Sciences*, 7:95–135, 1974.
- [32] T. J. Schaefer. The complexity of satisfiability problems. In *10th ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*, pages 216–226, 1978.
- [33] S. Toda. On the computational power of PP and $\oplus P$. In *30th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS 1989)*, pages 514–519. IEEE Computer Society, 1989.
- [34] L. G. Valiant. The complexity of computing the permanent. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 8:189–201, 1979.
- [35] L. G. Valiant. The complexity of enumeration and reliability problems. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 8(3):410–421, 1979.
- [36] D. Weitz. Counting independent sets up to the tree threshold. In *38th ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*, pages 140–149, 2006.
- [37] D. Welsh. *Complexity: Knots, Colourings and Counting*. Cambridge University Press, 1993.